

**REMARKS**

Claims 15 and 17-28 are presently pending in the application. Claims 16 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 18 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claim 18 has been amended to correct for any indefiniteness, in line with the Examiner's recommendations. Since the limitations of Claim 22 were not identified as being indefinite, the amendment to Claim 18 should obviate the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Claims 15 – 18, 20, and 22-28, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by *SOAP for Platform -Neutral Interoperability* (Kevin Brown, 9/12/2000) hereinafter "Brown". Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of *Software Magazine - Newsletter* (10/11/2000) hereinafter "Software Magazine". Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown.

Claim 16 has been canceled, and its recitations included in Claim 18.

For the following reasons, the prior art rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Applicant respectfully submits that Brown does not teach or suggest a method for handling requests using a computer, wherein the steps include verifying the first format of the request message for protocol and format, as recited in amended Claim 15.

Rather, Brown is silent with respect to the verifying step.

Accordingly, Claim 15 is not anticipated by Brown, and the rejection of Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) should be withdrawn.

Further, since Claim 17 depend from Claim 15, it is also patentably distinguishable over Brown for the reasons cited above with respect to Claim 15.

With respect to Claim 18, the Applicant respectfully submits that Brown does not teach or suggest a computer system for handling requests, which includes a translator which checks the request messages from the client computer system for protocol and format.

Rather, as stated above, Brown is silent with respect to checking the request message from the client computer for protocol and format.

Accordingly, Claim 18 is patentable over Brown, and the rejection of Claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) should be withdrawn.

Further, since Claims 19-28 depend from Claim 18, they are also patentably distinguishable over either the individual or the combination of Brown and Software Magazine, for the reasons cited above with respect to Claim 18.

If the Examiner believes that there is any issue which could be resolved by a telephone or personal interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Applicants hereby petition for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this application, and any required fee for such an extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean C. Edwards  
Jean C. Edwards  
Registration No. 41,728

AKERMAN SENTERFITT  
801 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W.  
Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
**Telephone: 202/824-1719**  
**Facsimile: 202/393-5959**  
**Date: December 5, 2005**